

## Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Summary

### Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

#### Section A: Overview & Summary Information

**Date Investment First Submitted:** 2009-06-30  
**Date of Last Change to Activities:** 2012-06-30  
**Investment Auto Submission Date:** 2012-02-28  
**Date of Last Investment Detail Update:** 2012-02-28  
**Date of Last Exhibit 300A Update:** 2012-06-30  
**Date of Last Revision:** 2012-08-01

**Agency:** 005 - Department of Agriculture      **Bureau:** 96 - Forest Service

**Investment Part Code:** 01

**Investment Category:** 00 - Agency Investments

**1. Name of this Investment:** ROSS - Resource Ordering and Status System

**2. Unique Investment Identifier (Ull):** 005-000000028

#### Section B: Investment Detail

- 1. Provide a brief summary of the investment, including a brief description of the related benefit to the mission delivery and management support areas, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment. Include an explanation of any dependencies between this investment and other investments.**

ROSS is the interagency Resource Ordering and Status System. ROSS is a core business application which supports the nation's emergency response framework. ROSS is recognized by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as the standard for a national mobilization system. ROSS has been implemented in more than 350 interagency dispatch offices nationwide that support member agencies of the National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG). Currently, there are more than 600 agencies that benefit from using ROSS. These agencies are comprised of the NWCG member agencies and those agencies who cooperate through agreement in meeting the mission of the NWCG agencies. ROSS reflects an interagency leadership vision by transforming the way that resource ordering and status activities are performed, replacing manual processes with more efficient and streamlined automated processes. Interagency representatives are extensively involved in the ROSS project. ROSS has dependencies on and interfaces with two systems: the Forest Service's Interagency Cache Business System (ICBS) and the Department of Interior's Interagency Qualifications and Certifications System (IQCS). These systems exchange data with ROSS to assure a consistent data set across systems. ROSS depends on ICBS for Supply Inventory and Supply Catalog Information. ROSS depends on IQCS for Resource Overhead and Resource Overhead Catalog Information.

**2. How does this investment close in part or in whole any identified performance gap in support of the mission delivery and management support areas? Include an assessment of the program impact if this investment isn't fully funded.**

Prior to the development of the ROSS application, resource ordering and status activities were all performed manually. In 1997, the original charter for ROSS was adopted. Between 1997 and 2005, ROSS was developed and successfully implemented by the user community. The ROSS application is recognized for transforming the business of resource ordering and statusing. Through the ROSS change management process, performance gaps were identified with the original chartered scope of ROSS. The ROSS Phase 2 project was chartered to address these gaps. For example, the ROSS application did not have the ability to manage tactical aviation resources efficiently. Another example of a gap includes system interfaces, such as creating generic data exchange capabilities so that related systems (e.g., IQCS) can share information with ROSS. ROSS Phase 2 was chartered to address these and other gaps. If ROSS does not acquire full funding, ROSS will not achieve the chartered scope of ROSS Phase 2. More importantly, if ROSS does not acquire full funding, the ability to support operations and maintenance is in jeopardy. Absent funding, the ROSS project risks failing to meet current and evolving business needs, making it difficult for dispatchers to do things efficiently because they may be forced to do things outside of ROSS. The ROSS Project Team has been criticized over and over again for not putting in place (in a timely manner) the components approved in the ROSS Phase 2 Charter. National and Geographic Reports and Reviews have pointed out that ROSS is not funded at the level necessary to implement the requirements of ROSS Phase 2 in the time frames required. Of note was extensive White House and Congressional attention resulting from issues occurring during the Southern California Fire Sieges (November 2007, June 2008, October 2008). Large reductions in the ROSS DME (Phase 2) budget from request is a major contributor to this issue. The ROSS Phase 2 has been reduced by nearly \$2 million from the requested level since FY-2008.

**3. Provide a list of this investment's accomplishments in the prior year (PY), including projects or useful components/project segments completed, new functionality added, or operational efficiency achieved.**

During 2011, ROSS release 2.14 occurred. The primary objective of version 2.14 was to complete the ROSS Reports Module through the addition of Analytical Reports (Historical), which provides access to multiple year datasets (from 2009 forward) and permits analysis of summary, trend and point in time information. Other objectives accomplished during 2011 included providing additional capability when searching, filtering, or viewing tracked supply requests and enhancing the Interagency Cache Business System (ICBS), Incident Qualification System (IQS) and Incident Qualifications and Certification System (IQCS) interfaces.

**4. Provide a list of planned accomplishments for current year (CY) and budget year (BY).**

During FY-2012 ROSS will release versions 2.14.1 and 2.15. The focus of these versions will be to refine the business processes associated with the ROSS / ICBS Data Exchange Interface. In addition, ROSS 2.14.1 will introduce a updated security model. In addition, these two releases will address business rule changes requested by the user community, patches

to the software, and defects identified through the ROSS change control process. In FY-2013 ROSS Version 3.0 will be released. ROSS 3.0 introduced a completely re-engineered system (Technically Refreshed) which utilizes the most current web technology available. This includes upgraded versions of all base software (e.g., Oracle) as well as ensuring that ROSS can run on new Operating Systems. In addition, ROSS 3.0 will enhance the security model from releases 2.14.1 and 2.15 even further to meet evolving OMB and departmental security requirements and position the ROSS application to respond more rapidly to new and emerging security threats. ROSS 3.0 also re-engineers the ROSS application for efficiency and speed (e.g., there is a new screen design that will combine existing screens reducing five and six screens to one screen so that users can do things more rapidly).

- 5. Provide the date of the Charter establishing the required Integrated Program Team (IPT) for this investment. An IPT must always include, but is not limited to: a qualified fully-dedicated IT program manager, a contract specialist, an information technology specialist, a security specialist and a business process owner before OMB will approve this program investment budget. IT Program Manager, Business Process Owner and Contract Specialist must be Government Employees.**

2011-09-01

## Section C: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Summary of Funding

	PY-1 & Prior	PY 2011	CY 2012	BY 2013
Planning Costs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DME (Excluding Planning) Costs:	\$17.9	\$4.4	\$3.0	\$2.0
DME (Including Planning) Govt. FTEs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Sub-Total DME (Including Govt. FTE):	\$17.9	\$4.4	\$3.0	\$2.0
O & M Costs:	\$21.0	\$6.2	\$7.4	\$7.0
O & M Govt. FTEs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Sub-Total O & M Costs (Including Govt. FTE):	\$21.0	\$6.2	\$7.4	\$7.0
Total Cost (Including Govt. FTE):	\$38.9	\$10.6	\$10.4	\$9.0
Total Govt. FTE costs:	0	0	0	0
# of FTE rep by costs:	0	0	0	0
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (\$)		\$0.0	\$-1.2	
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (%)		0.00%	-10.10%	

**2. If the funding levels have changed from the FY 2012 President's Budget request for PY or CY, briefly explain those changes:**

The summary of spending has changed from the prior year's (FY2010) budget request for ROSS. This is due to the decision to move the costs associated with the hot site to a separate Fire NESS investment and the decision to move all costs associated with the Help Desk to a separate investment. Both of these have resulted in a decrease in the overall cost of ROSS.

## Section D: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

Table I.D.1 Contracts and Acquisition Strategy

Contract Type	EVM Required	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	IDV Agency ID	Solicitation ID	Ultimate Contract Value (\$M)	Type	PBSA ?	Effective Date	Actual or Expected End Date
Awarded	12C2	<a href="#">AG82X9C055069</a>	GS35F4863G	4730							

**2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:**

ROSS has been a major investment since inception. In 2006, ROSS moved to O&M and the collection of EVM was stopped. ROSS Phase 2 (ROSS-2) was created in 2003 in response to new requirements for ROSS functionality. At that time, Forest Service leadership deemed ROSS-2 as a non-major investment and that EVM was not required. The government is considered to be the integrator for ROSS. As a result, the government receives monthly cost and schedule updates from all the contractors and integrates that information with the government's overall project management approach, and reports this information through the USDA EVM reporting system, SharePoint. The decision in 2007 to merge ROSS and ROSS-2 into a single investment resulted in Forest Service Leadership requiring EVM reporting for the combined ROSS Project. With this decision, Lockheed Martin, the development contractor, began to report earned value metrics (e.g., % complete) in 2008. The remaining contracts are described below:

- \* \* CPIC/Security - This contract provides support to several Fire Applications, including ROSS. It is fixed price; EVM is not required because it supports ROSS O&M.
- \* Tech Writer/SME - This contract focuses on providing subject matter expertise for ROSS and other Fire applications. This is for a single FTE that supports ROSS and other projects, and therefore is considered level of effort.
- \* SME - This contract also focuses on providing several SMEs for ROSS, each one supporting a specific technical area. This contract is for several individual SMEs who provide business expertise and is of effort.

## Exhibit 300B: Performance Measurement Report

### Section A: General Information

**Date of Last Change to Activities:** 2012-06-30

### Section B: Project Execution Data

**Table II.B.1 Projects**

Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Start Date	Project Completion Date	Project Lifecycle Cost (\$M)
1	ROSS Operations and Maintenance (O&M)	Operations and Maintenance of the ROSS application.			
2	ROSS Development Modernization and Enhancement (DME)	DME of the remaining Phase 2 scope of the ROSS application.			

### Activity Summary

Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities

Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project Activities (\$M)	End Point Schedule Variance (in days)	End Point Schedule Variance (%)	Cost Variance (\$M )	Cost Variance (%)	Total Planned Cost (\$M)	Count of Activities
1	ROSS Operations and Maintenance (O&M)							
2	ROSS Development Modernization and Enhancement (DME)							

### Key Deliverables

Project Name	Activity Name	Description	Planned Completion Date	Projected Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Duration (in days)	Schedule Variance (in days )	Schedule Variance (%)
--------------	---------------	-------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------

Key Deliverables								
Project Name	Activity Name	Description	Planned Completion Date	Projected Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Duration (in days)	Schedule Variance (in days )	Schedule Variance (%)
2	Field Test Release 1	Deveopment of FTR 1	2012-01-22	2012-01-22	2012-01-22	113	0	0.00%
2	Field Test Release 2	Development of FTR 2	2012-05-20	2012-05-20	2012-05-20	121	0	0.00%
2	Field Test Release 3	Development of FTR 3	2012-07-22	2012-07-22		181	-40	-22.10%
2	Field Test Release 4	Development of FTR 4	2012-08-19	2012-08-19		181	-12	-6.63%
2	Field Test Release 5	Development of FTR 5	2012-09-23	2012-09-23		184	0	0.00%
2	Field Test Release 6	Development of FTR 6	2012-10-21	2012-10-21		153	0	0.00%

## Section C: Operational Data

Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics

Metric Description	Unit of Measure	FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping	Measurement Condition	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY	Reporting Frequency
Help desk time to answer the phone is 95% less than 60 seconds.	Number (percentage)	Customer Results - Service Quality	Over target	95.000000	95.000000	96.900000	95.000000	Monthly
Help desk time to answer an email 95% within 24 hours of receipt.	Number (Percent)	Customer Results - Service Quality	Over target	95.000000	95.000000	99.190000	95.000000	Monthly
The number of customer requests for unique reports is fewer than 24/year.	Number	Process and Activities - Management and Innovation	Over target	24.000000	24.000000	24.000000	24.000000	Semi-Annual
Server availability time (up time).	Number (Percent)	Technology - Reliability and Availability	Over target	95.000000	95.000000	100.000000	95.000000	Quarterly
Help desk availability is greater than or equal to 99.75%.	Number (percentage)	Technology - Reliability and Availability	Over target	99.750000	99.750000	100.000000	99.750000	Monthly